

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Morrison et al.

Serial No.: 10/797,647

Filed: March 10, 2004

For: SEMICONDUCTOR BGA PACKAGE
HAVING A SEGMENTED VOLTAGE
PLANE AND METHOD OF MAKING

Confirmation No.: 4195

Examiner: M. Lewis

Group Art Unit: 2822

Attorney Docket No.: 2269-6103US
(03-0954.00/US)

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING
May 8, 2007**

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is filed in response to the Notice of Allowance mailed February 9, 2007 and sets forth Applicant's comments, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e), on the Examiner's Statement of Allowable Subject Matter accompanying the Notice of Allowance.

In the Notice of Allowance, the Examiner indicates:


In regards to claim 16, the prior art fails to disclose the following: a) at least a part of the electrical current isolation slot is coextensive with material of the dielectric film (Note: Figure 4 of Kinsman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,268,650) discloses a slot between substrates (12) and underneath tape (100). However, Kinsman fails to disclose that the slot is coextensive with material of the dielectric film.).

Applicants concur with the reasons as stated by the Examiner insofar as they comprise a summary, which is exemplary and not limiting. However, the scope of the claims is based on the actual language of the claims and equivalents thereof, and not on a paraphrase or summary of the claim language.

The Independent claims as allowed recite features and methodology in addition to, and in different language than, those described in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite elements in addition to those of the independent claims, which are also not reflected in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Such additional elements, in combination with those of the independent claims from which each claim depends, provide additional reasons for patentability. Accordingly, the scope of the claims must be determined from the literal language of each as a whole, as well as all equivalents thereof.

Therefore, to the extent that the Examiner's reasons for allowance as stated are not relevant to, or wholly encompassing of, a particular claim, independent or dependent, Applicants assume that (pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e)) the Examiner has determined that the record of the prosecution as a whole of the application makes clear the reasons for allowing those claims. Further, it appears, pursuant to M.P.E.P. 1302.14, that the Examiner's Statements of Allowable Subject Matter are not intended to encompass all of the reasons for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph A. Walkowski
Registration No. 28,765
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: May 8, 2007
JMM/dlm
Document in ProLaw